



**The Task Force on Court Facilities**  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

**Meeting Report**

January 27 & 28, 1999  
Mission Inn, Riverside, CA

<p><b>ATTENDEES:</b></p> <p><b>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</b></p> <p><b>PRESENT:</b> Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair Mr. Greg Abel Mr. Wylie Aitken Hon. Joan B. Bechtel Mr. John Clarke Mr. Mike Courtney Sheriff Robert T. Doyle Hon. Jerry Eaves Hon. Gary Freeman Mr. David Janssen Hon. Wayne Peterson Hon. Charles V. Smith Mr. Anthony Tyrrell Hon. Diane Elan Wick</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Ms. Yvonne Campos Hon. Martha Escutia Mr. Fred Klass Hon. Michael Nail</p> <p><b>TASK FORCE STAFF:</b> Mr. Robert Lloyd, Project Coordinator / Senior Facilities Planner Ms. Veronica Gomez, Staff Analyst</p>	<p><b>PRESENTERS:</b> Mr. Dan Smith, DSA-Vitetta Mr. Andy Cupples, DMJM</p> <p><b>CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE:</b> Mr. Andrew Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Mr. Jeff Buck, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Ms. Kim Steinjann, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Mr. Dan Smith, Daniel C. Smith &amp; Associates/Vitetta Group Ms. Kathy Bruns, Daniel C. Smith &amp; Associates/Vitetta Group Mr. Thomas Gardner, Vitetta Group</p> <p><b>GUESTS:</b> Ms. Kellie Bieber, Orange County Mr. Rick Dostal, Orange County Mr. Peter Conlon, Orange County Superior Court Mr. Ron Guley, Orange County Superior Court Mr. Kevin Stinson, Orange County Superior Court Ms. Sue Bost, Department of Finance Mr. Rubin Lopez, California State Association of Counties Ms. Gale Webb, Riverside County Law Library Ms. Stephanie Larsen, San Joaquin County Ms. Carol Shearer, San Bernadino County Mr. Art Gomez, San Bernardino County Mr. John Van Wherivin, Los Angeles Superior Court Mr. Ron Taylor, Omni Group, Inc. Ms. Lyla Corfman, Imperial Superior Court Mr. Nick Marinovich, County of San Diego Mr. Jack Miller, County of San Diego</p> <p><b>SPEAKERS:</b> Mr. Dennis Paoletti, Paoletti Associates, Inc. Mr. Tom Shield, T.L. Shield and Assoc., Inc. Mr. Garry Raley, Riverside County Mr. Art Sims, Riverside County Hon. Robert Taylor, Riverside County Mr. Charles Dyer, Council of California Law Librarians</p>
---	--

## **DAY 1 – WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1999**

### **I. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME – Justice Daniel Kremer**

- 1) Justice Kremer opened the Task Force meeting at 10:00 AM. He introduced Mr. Mike Courtney who replaced Mr. Eugene Spindler as the Department of General Services member.
- 2) The meeting report from the December 2 – 3, 1998 meeting was approved
- 3) Working Group charters, which were previously reviewed by the Executive Committee in their January 7, 1999 meeting, were presented to the Task Force. The Standards and Evaluation Committee, during its meeting earlier this date, recommended:
  - a) Adding a representative of the Department of Finance to the Appellate Court Facility Standards Working Group,
  - b) Adding a court administrator from a large, unified county to the Unification Working Group, and
  - c) Adding a court administrator from a small county to the Technology Working Group.The Task Force approved the working group charters with these changes. The Task Force also approved the proposed membership of the working groups. The revised charters and membership list is attached.
- 4) Justice Kremer reported that he made a presentation of the status and direction of the Task Force at the California Sheriff's Association's Court Security Committee's meeting in Shell Beach, CA.
- 5) Mr. Lloyd reported on the CSAC Trial Court Facility Advisory Committee meeting January 13, 1999 in Santa Ana, CA. Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Kim Steinjann (DMJM) attended the meeting at the committee's request. The purpose of the meeting was to review the court evaluation process described in the Task Force's work plan and share the committee's concerns about the "field survey instrument" contained in the Task Force's Work Plan. The committee had the following suggestions:
  - a) Clearly define "standard" versus "suitable and adequate."
  - b) Ensure procedures recognize that all counties are different (size, politics, amount of crime/litigation, nature of criminals, urban vs. Rural).
  - c) Separate "Hard" data (objective) vs. "Soft data" (subjective).
    - (1) Use Checklists.
    - (2) Avoid the use of pass/fail criteria.
    - (3) Do not assign relative ratings for evaluating different court components.
  - d) Use two points of contact for collecting information – the County Administrative Office & the Courts.
    - (1) Send information requests out early.
    - (2) Give the counties and courts the opportunity to review reports before they are final.
  - e) Collect information on trials, judicial equivalents, overcrowding and unacceptable waits due to the facility.
    - (1) Document underutilized space (i.e. courtrooms) through a survey of utilization hours.
    - (2) Document maintenance needs through facility records.
  - f) Collect information on court building financing.
  - g) Collect historical and projected information on unification's impact on court facilities.
  - h) Collect historical and projected information on case growth.
  - i) Collect historical and projected information on space needs and growth.
  - j) Develop recommendations for changes that mitigate facility needs.
  - k) Ensure that co-location requirements are recognized.

Supervisor Smith sent a letter recapping the issues presented to the Task Force members; noting that the meeting was useful and productive. Mr. Lloyd stated that the majority of these recommendations are addressed in the Task Force's Work Plan and the charters of the committees and working groups. This was explained to the CSAC committee during the meeting. Mr. Lloyd noted that recommendations that

are not currently addressed in the Work Plan or charters will either be incorporated into the “field survey instrument” or referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

- 6) Justice Kremer presented an overview of the Task Force meeting agenda. The main presentation will focus on the Phase 2 standards development using the courtroom as a case study. Guest speakers will make presentations on acoustics, audiovisual, and accessibility. The Task Force will also tour the Riverside Hall of Justice, Family Law Court, and the Riverside County Court, a recently renovated historic courthouse. An optional tour of the 4<sup>th</sup> District Court of Appeal, Division 2 will be conducted Thursday (1/28) afternoon. Representatives of the Riverside County Superior Court and the California Association of Law Librarians will make lunchtime presentations. The Task Force’s committees will also meet Wednesday afternoon (11/27).

## **II. SCHEDULE REVIEW – Mr. Dan Smith**

- 1) A FY 99/00 meeting schedule was proposed for the Task Force. The proposed schedule was approved with the following revision:
  - a) Meeting #9 in Orange County was rescheduled to Dec. 8 & 9, 1999
  - b) Meeting #10 will be held in Napa
  - c) Meeting #11 will be in Chico.
- 2) This review of the meeting schedule prompted rescheduling meeting #7 in Los Angeles to May 26 & 27, 1999. The approved meeting schedule changes will be made to the website.
- 3) An inquiry was made concerning the change to quarterly meetings in FY 99/00. Mr. Lloyd responded that, by midyear, the data collection process will be in “full swing” and Task Force meetings will not need to be more frequent until the data on the condition of court facilities is gathered. He also noted that the present frequency of meetings does not lend itself well to the necessary preparation time for each meeting.

## **III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

- 1) There were no public comment requests submitted.

## **IV. PHASE 2: STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW– Mr. Dan Smith**

- 1) Mr. Smith reviewed the existing state level standards, noting that tasks 2a and 2b work (from the Work Plan) provide a foundation for establishing the breadth, depth and level of utilization of the proposed guidelines. At the last meeting, the Task Force determined court functions contained in the courthouse. The approved outline is attached. Mr. Smith will present a detailed draft format of all the components at the next meeting. This meeting will focus on one component, the courtroom.
- 2) Future presentations to the Task Force will focus on the field survey instrument, county and statewide space projections, and the database management system. At the May 1999 Task Force meeting (#7), final draft guidelines will be presented based on the committee’s recommendations. Progress on the space needs projections will be presented. Also, findings and recommendations from the working groups will be presented.
- 3) Mr. Janssen inquired if the projections were separated by civil and criminal cases. Mr. Cupples replied that filing statistics and projections are being done by case type. He noted that these projections are being used to set facility planning guidelines, not management and/or operational policy. Mr. Smith added that the present state standards assume one size fits all; it doesn’t really work with different types of caseloads.

## **V. PRESENTATION – COURTROOM ACOUSTICS/AUDIOVISUAL NEEDS – Mr. Dennis Paoletti**

- 1) Mr. Dennis Paoletti, Paoletti Associates, made a presentation on the acoustic and audiovisual needs of the courtroom. From his experience with the Federal General Services Administration (GSA), he presented a historical perspective of courtroom audiovisual design beginning when audiovisual tools consisted of, simply, overhead and slide projectors. GSA would typically strike out the audiovisual budget line items to cut costs; ultimately impacting the users. The United States – Administrative Office of the Courts (USAOC) took over planning responsibilities for the courtroom; developing

specific audiovisual criteria. Presently, with rapidly changing computerized technology, it is important to address audiovisual needs in the programming phase of design and test the installed equipment once built to see if it works as specified.

- 2) The basic principle of audiovisual design is simple: everyone involved must see and hear clearly. However, the application of this principle is not simple. The presentation materials, resolution, brightness, contrast, sizes and location of screens, costs and architectural implications must all be carefully considered. Currently the use of wireless technology, flat panel displays and High Definition Television (HDTV) are hot topics. Additionally, attention to the way the technology interacts with the physical qualities of a room needs to be considered, including reverberation and sound isolation.
- 3) Mr. Paoletti provided graphic examples of typical systems, equipment costs and locations his firm recommends in the courtroom.
- 4) Good design and space planning play a crucial role in alleviating most sound problems by isolating noise-generating uses from those that require quiet. Mechanical systems are always a problem and, typically, more attention is needed during the design process to identify sound transmission paths to effectively isolate noise. It was noted that background noise, at the appropriate levels, is necessary in a room to mask certain sounds (i.e., conversation at a "sidebar" conference).
- 5) Mr. Janssen asked Mr. Paoletti if he has reviewed the draft guidelines. Mr. Paoletti responded that the general terminology needs massaging (i.e. the term "soundproofing" is incorrect) and suggested that the guidelines should keep up with the "state of the future" technology instead of "state of the art," since technology is evolving at a rapid pace.
- 6) Mr. Paoletti reiterated his position that the programming phase of a design project and subsequent testing of the installed systems are the path to a successful project. Periodic revisions of guidelines to keep up with changing technology will help ensure that the courtroom will accept the space needs of the new systems.

#### **VI. LUNCH PRESENTATION – Mr. Garry Raley, Mr. Art Sims, and Hon. Robert Taylor**

- 1) An informal presentation by local court officials was made regarding the way the local trial courts have been handling unification, funding, and new construction.

#### **VII. PRESENTATION - COURTROOM ACCESSIBILITY – Mr. Tom Shield**

- 1) Mr. Tom Shield, of T.L. Shield and Assoc., Inc., a supply contractor for access elevators, presented his views on courtroom accessibility. In reference to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Mr. Shield stated that the path of accessibility starts at the parking lot, progressing to the building entry, through the corridors, to and within the courtroom. He showed a company video, "Accessibility in the Courtroom," which highlighted different mechanical approaches to accessibility including inclined lifts, standard lifts, retractable ramps (6" height maximum), and a low profile lift ("invisible lift"). He noted that he has not seen a design solution where one lift adequately serves the jury, witness and judge.
- 2) Mr. Courtney suggested that any access guidelines be reviewed by the state architect and other state agencies; including the state accessibility group that reviews projects to see if they fulfill the intent of Title 24 requirements.
- 3) Judge Wick noted that accessibility advocates are strong and demand that all courtroom benches be fully accessible. In her experience, they will not consider deviations from this position. Justice Kremer added that he has had a similar experience, and noted that this may become a political issue if the Task Force attempts to establish standards that require only a percentage of the benches to be fully accessible.
- 4) Mr. Smith noted that another key issue is whether partial compliance with accessibility standards is acceptable in existing buildings or if 100% compliance with accessibility standards is always required.

## **VIII. COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

- 1) The Task Force adjourned into committees. Committee meeting reports are attached.

## **IX. COURT TOUR – Mr. Garry Raley**

- 1) Mr. Raley gave a guided tour of the restored County Courthouse and new Family Law Court facilities.

## **DAY 2 – THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1999**

## **X. PHASE 2: STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT – Mr. Andy Cupples**

- 1) Mr. Cupples conducted a slide presentation of various courtroom images to illustrate good courtroom design. He discussed the following issues:
  - a) Area/size.
  - b) Proportion.
  - c) Ceiling height (well vs. public seating).
  - d) Adjacency of judge to clerk.
  - e) Appropriate separation distances.
  - f) Attorney seating capacity.
  - g) Requirements for complex trials (more difficult due to several parties and more resources involved) versus simpler trials (higher percentage of settlements).
  - h) ADA cost impacts (usually \$10,000-15,000/bench).
  - i) Multi-use courtrooms (100% accessibility).
  - j) Public seating – theater versus bench style plus ADA compliance.
  - k) Location of jury deliberation (Mr. Cupples suggested this room be accessible from both public and private areas so it can be used for other purposes).
  - l) Larger courthouses, with 8 or more courtrooms, may be able to share support areas like jury rooms and witness waiting areas.
  - m) Sight lines between the judge, witness, jury, and attorneys.
- 2) It was noted that a do and don't list might be of better use than standards in conveying what works and what will cause shortcomings.
- 3) While developing the standards, the Task Force needs to carefully consider how the guidelines relate to new and renovated buildings versus existing buildings; especially in terms of case types.
- 4) The express wording and terminology of the proposed guidelines was discussed. Can the guidelines be challenged? How can the Task Force determine that an operating courtroom is inadequate?
- 5) Mr. Cupples added that the guidelines are optimum levels with the capability of being adjusted once minimally acceptable levels are determined by case type.
- 6) The Task Force adjourned to a courtroom in the Riverside County Superior Court for the purpose of analyzing and evaluating it in light of the standards being considered. A courtroom evaluation form presented by Mr. Smith was handed out for facilitating discussion (attached).

## **XI. TASK FORCE DISCUSSION OF THE COURTROOM, A CASE STUDY – Mr. Dan Smith**

- 1) The Task Force convened at the Hall of Justice, Department 35 courtroom (converted from existing office space, approx. 1000 SF) to discuss courtroom issues in relation to the standards being considered.
  - a) Mr. Raley noted that the existing space did not lend itself to reconfiguration as a courtroom. The lighting (fixtures and locations), acoustics, area of separation in the well, security (no separate circulation for in custody defendants), lack of infrastructure to support audiovisual equipment, HVAC and accessibility are all problems that impede the court's use of the space.
  - b) Judge Wick asked about the operational costs of this and other courtrooms. She noted that some courtrooms are made "acceptable" by spending disproportionately on operational costs

- (i.e. increased security due to a lack of holding facilities) to compensate for deficiencies in the design of the courtroom and immediate support spaces.
- 2) The Task Force moved to the Department 5 courtroom in the County Courthouse to continue the review of the proposed courtroom design standards.
    - a) The room (approx. 1600 SF) was originally designed as the county assessor's office. The courtroom has a corner bench with a low profile floor lift at the witness box for access to bench, witness box, and lower level of the jury box.
    - b) The lift was required to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA); satisfying the local Building Official. The lift, which cost \$30,000, has not been used since it was installed.
    - c) Mr. Raley commented that jurors liked the jury box chairs that are adjustable and have glides. He also noted that the public seems to prefer theatre seating versus bench seats.
    - d) It was stated that the litigation area (the "well") is a major driver of the size of the courtroom, especially in multi-defendant trials which require additional seating for paralegals, court interpreters, additional attorneys, etc.
    - e) Mr. Lloyd emphasized that the Task Force members must understand the space planning concepts that drive the size of a room and be able to defend the resulting guideline; particularly if a new guideline changes one of those contained in the Judicial Council's "Trial Court Facility Standards" published in 1991 (the "Black Book").
    - f) Mr. Courtney asked if it was intended that the state legislature adopt the "guidelines" developed by the Task Force as a basis for planning and estimating the cost of facilities projects as part of the state budget process; as is currently the practice with schools and state offices. It was noted that the Judicial Council, as the lead planning and policy body of a separate branch of state government, is responsible for setting court facility standards, not the legislature. The Task Force is required by AB 233 to determine "acceptable court facility standards" for use in evaluating existing court facilities and determining the potential cost for new or renovated ones.
    - g) Mr. Smith stated that the Task Force must clearly define the purpose of the guidelines and their level of detail. The Task Force must identify the types of spaces which require standards or guidelines, the size of the space, the character of the space (including environmental issues such as lighting, heating, air conditioning, acoustic performance, etc.), and the required infrastructure necessary to efficiently and effectively support the use of the room.
    - h) Justice Kremer noted that it was helpful to convene in the courtrooms to focus the discussion.
  - 3) The Task Force returned to the hotel meeting room for a lunchtime presentation.

## **XII. LUNCH PRESENTATION – Mr. Charles Dyer**

- 1) Mr. Dyer, president of the Council of California County Law Librarians, presented, at the request of the Task Force, the history and facility concerns of the county librarians. He noted that the law libraries are required by state law and that the majority of their "customers" are non-attorneys preparing to represent themselves as a "pro pers." He said that law libraries need to be in the courthouse or very close to them since their customer base is tied to court proceedings. He noted that the law libraries are, typically, considered only as an afterthought in the design process and that their facilities are often inadequate to fulfill their mission. He asked that the Task Force consider law libraries an integral part of the judicial system and that their space be considered a necessary component of courthouse construction; proposing that the Task Force include them in their study. Mr. Dyer offered to provide the Task Force with any assistance necessary in making an informed decision on the inclusion of law libraries in the Task Force's study.

## **XIII. COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS**

### **1) Standards and Evaluations Committee – Judge Wayne Peterson**

- a) The committee reviewed the written charters and proposed members for their working groups: Appellate Court Facility Standards, Impact of Unification on Court Facilities,

Security, and Technology. They approved the charters and members with the following modifications:

- (1) Added a representative of the Department of Finance to the Appellate Court Facility Standards Working Group
  - (2) Added a representative from a large county, unified court to the Impact of Unification on Court Facilities Working Group
  - (3) Added a small county court representative to the Technology Working Group
- b) The Committee also reviewed and discussed the proposed structure of the Facility Standards as well as the recommendations for the courtroom. Judge Peterson noted that the standards information they reviewed will form the basis for discussion throughout the of the Task Force meeting.

**2) Needs Analysis and Projections Committee – Mr. Anthony Tyrrell**

- a) Mr. Tyrrell noted that the committee had a lively and productive discussion over the proposed statewide space projections and asked Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Cupples to brief the Task Force on the details.
- b) Mr. Lloyd informed the Task Force that he had presented the results of the Statistical Oversight Working Group's meeting of January 12, 1999 to the Committee. The working group thoroughly analyzed Justice Planning Associates' recommendations for statewide judgeship and filing forecasts which will form the basis of statewide space forecasts. They found them to be logical, consistent, and reasonable. The working group recommended that the Committee, and the Task Force, approve the statewide forecasts based upon the following understanding and allow JPA to proceed with county forecasting:
  - (1) the purpose of the judgeship projections is clearly understood (and documented) as a space/facility planning tool, and
  - (2) the projections are used for "benchmarking" with independent projections developed for larger counties. Proportioned statewide data may be sufficient for projecting the future space needs of some smaller counties.

The committee recommended that the Task Force approve JPA proceeding with county forecasts. A motion to proceed to county forecasts was made, seconded, and unanimously approved by the Task Force.

- c) Mr. Cupples noted the committee expressed significant concern regarding how the impact of consolidation would affect current and future space needs. They requested a presentation on what anticipated impacts of unification were presented to the legislature in gaining their approval of the state constitutional amendment. They also asked for a panel discussion from courts that have been consolidated (or coordinated) for a period of time regarding their experience with the impact on judicial and staff resources. These presentations will be scheduled for a future committee meeting.

**XIV. Finance and Implementation Committee – Mr. David Janssen**

- a) Mr. Janssen commented that the committee is still in a learning mode. Yesterday's session included a presentation by Mr. Jonathan Wolin from the Administrative Office of the Courts' Trial Court Budget Unit. The topic presented was on the trial court budget process adopted after enactment of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997.
- b) At the next committee meeting, the members will look at current state models on capital outlay, and review the amount of funding generated annually by the Courthouse Construction Fund by county.
- c) The discussion focused on increases to filing fees as a possible revenue source, but it was noted that this would probably mean an increase in fee waivers. At present, documentation justifying waiver is not required; therefore a recommendation could be made for a better review of fee waivers. It was also suggested that a survey requesting county financial information include a request for historical data on the number fee of waivers requested and granted over the last few years. Justice Kremer agreed with the concerns but stated that the Task Force needs to be fully informed before making any recommendations in this area.
- d) Mr. Rubin Lopez, California State Association of Counties' (CSAC) representative, commented that CSAC is seeking legislation that would make the resulting findings of the

Task Force retroactive. Mr. Eaves asked to make a presentation on this topic at the next Task Force meeting. During the presentation, he would, also, address Mr. Abel's request for more information on SB 35, Senator Baca's bill that would impose a \$50 fee on civil filings for court construction.

**XV. PHASE 2: TASK D PRELIMINARY STANDARDS – Mr. Dan Smith**

- 1) Mr. Smith emphasized that guidelines are necessary for evaluating existing court facilities and quantifying future space needs and are an indispensable tool in the development of the court facilities master plan and capital investment plan. He noted that the "survey instruments," part of the data collection process, is different than the guidelines. The "survey instruments" (forms) are currently in development. The forms, their use and the finalized field evaluation plan will be presented to the Task Force in a future meeting.
- 2) Mr. Smith asked for approval of the proposed outline of the court facilities guidelines, which reflects the approved function matrix from the last Task Force meeting. The motion could not be voted upon since there was not a quorum, though the 8 present Task Force members accepted the outline as proposed and directed staff to ask the missing members to vote, in absentia, on approving the outline of the guidelines.
- 3) The next item for review and approval was the level of detail of the guidelines by focusing on the draft section on the courtroom.
  - a) Mr. Janssen reiterated the point presented earlier that, in general, the existing standards are reviewed but not really used in the design of court facilities. Mr. Freeman suggested that the guidelines should be used as a checklist, to raise questions for judges and to show to the funding authorities.
  - b) Mr. Janssen pointed out that the Task Force needs to really show why the proposed increase in courtroom space is necessary. Judge Peterson replied that the impact of ADA requirements may cause an increase in floor area. Mr. Janssen requested that the Task Force look at the impact of ADA requirements on 1500 square foot courtrooms. Mr. Cupples and Mr. Smith agreed to present the Task Force with schematic (diagrammatic) analysis of the proposed courtroom sizes, graphically illustrating how different courtroom components, such as the size of the well, access to the witness box, etc., drive courtroom size.
  - c) Mr. Abel directed the discussion to the proposed courtroom size by type guidelines. He asked if the Task Force accepted multiple courtroom sizes standards versus the 1991 "one size fits all" courtroom size standard. After discussion, the Task Force agreed that multiple courtroom sizes should be included in the guidelines and reflect the following courtroom types:
    - (1) Non-jury – civil and family hearing
    - (2) 12 Person jury – criminal and civil
    - (3) Multiple jury – multiple defendant/litigant – arraignment (high profile, high security cases with accommodation for media)The standard should provide a size range (i.e. Non-jury - civil and family hearing: 1,000 to 1200 square feet) with clear examples of when the low or high size would be appropriate.
  - d) In addition, the Task Force directed the following changes and/or action to the proposed courtroom guidelines:
    - (1) Header (all pages): Remove "and appellate"; appellate court facilities will have a separate section in the standard.
    - (2) Page 5 – Paragraph 2.b Acoustics and Audibility. Sound Locks: Delete "generally" in the second sentence and change "should" to "may" in the last sentence.
    - (3) Page 5 – Paragraph 2.c Acoustics and Audibility. Soundproofing: Change "should" to will in the second sentence.
    - (4) Page 8 – "Courtroom Lighting Guidelines": Verify the recommended guidelines with the Illuminating Engineers Society (IES) standards.
    - (5) Page 9 – "Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Guidelines": HVAC system should automatically adjust to different heating and cooling loads (i.e., the number of people in the space, the time of day, the time of year). The consultant was



directed to review the proposed standards with their mechanical engineers and to ensure that they consider state energy standards. The location of air intake to ensure indoor air quality should also be addressed in the standard.

- (6) Page 9 – “Circulation”: Change the first sentence to read “A courtroom designed for criminal proceedings should provide for three distinct points of entry for the following populations:” The guidelines should also include a note that two separate circulation systems are required for civil cases.
- (7) Page 10 – “Bench”: remove “sloped” from work surface section.
- (8) Page 12 – “Court Clerk’s Workstation”: Adjust size to accommodate 2 people. Replace “the workstation should be raised 14 inches off the courtroom floor” with the notation that layout should provide for easy transfer of documents and communication between clerk and judge. Include bullet resistant material in the design of the workstation.
- (9) Page 14 – “Witness Stand”: Replace “14 inches” with 10-13 inches, adding that the level should be in proper relation to the bench height.
- (10) Page 16 – “Jury Box”: Delete “be fixed” in the second sentence. Add note to chair section that chairs should be adjustable to the varying body sizes of jurors and note that a toe kick under the rail can provide extra foot space.
- (11) Page 17 – “Counsel Tables”: Verify that a 3’ x 7’ table will accommodate four people. Indicate that the counsel tables could be modular, consisting of 4 sections each seating 2 persons, to allow for flexibility in the number of plaintiffs/defendants. Where space is constrained, the design could allow for two plaintiffs and four defendants.
- (12) Page 18 – “Display Area and Equipment”: Replace specific listing of equipment with a philosophical statement of appropriate display equipment, use of technology, and design to accommodate them.
- (13) Page 19 - Tabular summary of courtroom elements: Modify numbers per previous line item changes under elevation and size of workstation headings.
- (14) Page 21 – “Audio, Video, and Electronic Technology”: The first sentence may be too philosophical. The consultant is to review the Electrical section (pages 21-24) and determine if this section, as written, reflects the “state of the art.” An electrical engineering consultant should review technical specifications (i.e. on page 21). On page 24 specify flush floor boxes and remove “(and timing system, in court of appeals).”
- (15) Audio (page 25): Remove court reporter/recorder’s station reference.
- (16) Page 27 – Accessibility of the Disabled: Review state court facility standards with the State Architect and accessibility advocates to ensure compliance with the intent of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and that crucial needs and possible variances are appropriately recognized.
- (17) Mr. Abel proposed that an ergonomics consultant review each section addressing specific staff work areas (i.e. clerk) to reduce the likelihood of repetitive stress injuries. Mr. Lloyd suggested that the guidelines should note this concern but let the architect/interior designer and their ergonomic advisers address this area on a case by case basis.

- e) Mr. Smith stated that the Task Force needs to establish a framework within the facility guidelines that ensures periodic updates to keep up with changes in A/V, HVAC, technology, and electrical areas based upon changing industry standards.
- f) Mr. Smith added that at the next Task Force meeting graphic representations of the space needs of the courtroom components will be presented.
- 4) The Task Force directed that the preliminary standards be sent to the State Sheriffs' and Court Reporters' Associations for their review and comment. It was noted that this could be done after the July 1 submission to the Governor, Judicial Council, and Legislature but should be done shortly thereafter so that any resulting changes can be incorporated prior to extensive field evaluation of court facilities.
- 5) Due to the lack of a quorum, the motion to approve could not be voted upon. Justice Kremer asked Mr. Lloyd to circulate the proposed changes to the missing members and seek their approval prior to the next Task Force meeting.
- 6) Mr. Abel expressed concern that too many Task Force members are missing critical parts of meetings and need to re-examine their scheduling priorities. He noted that all of the members have busy schedules but that the charge of Task Force represents a serious responsibility that must be recognized by the members and they should schedule their time accordingly. He noted that the consultant could not proceed with the last 2 tasks on the agenda because of a lack of a quorum. He asked that a reminder of this be sent to all members. Justice Kremer agreed to send a letter on this topic.
- 7) The meeting adjourned at 3:20PM.

**XVI. OPTIONAL TOUR – COURT OF APPEAL, 4<sup>TH</sup> APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION 2 – Mr. Robert Lloyd**

- 1) An optional tour of the new California 4<sup>th</sup> District Court of Appeal was conducted. The new court is located in Riverside and opened in January 1999.